



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10 092,810	03 07 2002	Miri Seiberg	JBP586	1963

27777 7590 01 29 2003

AUDLEY A. CIAMPORCERO JR.
JOHNSON & JOHNSON
ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA
NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003

EXAMINER

MELLER, MICHAEL V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1654

DATE MAILED: 01/29/2003

§

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/092,810

Applicant(s)

SEIBERG ET AL.

Examiner

Michael V. Meller

Art Unit

1654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 October 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-69 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-23, 25-27, 31-37, 39, 41-43 and 47-69 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 24, 28-30, 38, 40, 44-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group IV in Paper No. 7 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that searching all of the groups of claims should not entail a burden on the Patent Office, but this is without merit or evidence. This is not found persuasive because applicant has provided absolutely no reasoning, evidence or other information which would support their position. The reasons for restriction are of record.

Further it is noted that claims 59-62 were included in Group IV but it is clear from the record that claims 59-62 were intended for group V which is clear from the restriction requirement. Thus, claims 59-62 are not part of the elected group, they are in group V which was not elected. Thus, claims, 1-23, 25-27, 31-37, 39, 41-43, 47-69 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner as being drawn to non-elected inventions.

The election of species is noted. The species requirement with regard to the cells and the disorder is dropped. The agent election if STI (soy trypsin inhibitor) is maintained and is noted.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 24, 28-30, 38, 40, 44-46 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by copending Application No. 09/110,409 which discloses the composition of STI (soy trypsin inhibitor) and a cosmetically acceptable carrier/vehicle and discloses a method of using the composition which inherently will decrease phagocytosis or ICAM-1 expression in a mammalian cell as in the instant application.

Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the copending application, it would constitute prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), if patented. This provisional rejection

under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is based upon a presumption of future patenting of the copending application.

This provisional rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the copending application was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

This rejection may not be overcome by the filing of a terminal disclaimer. See *In re Bartfeld*, 925 F.2d 1450, 17 USPQ2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Claims 24, 28-30, 38, 40, 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Holmgren et al. (col. 17), Hammonds, Jr. et al. (col. 36), or Hammonds et al. (col. 37).

The references each teach administering STI to a patient.

Claims 24, 28-30, 38, 40, 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Costanzo.

The reference teaches administering STI, see col. 8 and 10.

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 24, 28-30, 38, 40, 44-46 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-25 and 56-59 of copending Application No. 09/110,409. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The above noted claims of the instant application and claims 1-25 and 56-59 of 09/110,409 are directed to a method of administering the same compound (STI) to a patient, thus they will inherently have the same effects on the body.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 24, 28-30, 38, 40, 44-46 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-25, 56-59 of copending Application No. 09/110,409. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows:

The claims of the instant application are obvious over the claims of 09/110,409 since it is obvious to add a cosmetically acceptable carrier/vehicle to the claims of 09/110,409 as taught in the instant application. It is also obvious to use such a composition as claimed in 09/110,409 for the method of the instant application since adding a cosmetically acceptable carrier/vehicle is taught in the instant application and both applications teaching treating a patient with their respective compositions and the composition of 09/110,409 will inherently decrease phagocytosis or ICAM-1 expression in a mammalian cell as in the instant application.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Application/Control Number: 10/092,810
Art Unit: 1654

Page 8

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. V. Meller', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

MICHAEL V. MELLER
PATENT EXAMINER